



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/825,534	03/28/97	YOUNG	J 06998/022001

FISH AND RICHARDSON
601 THIRTEENTH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005

LM61/0120

EXAMINER

LERNER, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2741

DATE MAILED:

01/20/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/825,534

Applicant(s)
Young et al.

Examiner
Martin Lerner

Group Art Unit
2741

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Martin Lerner

(3) Diana DiBerardino

(2) John Hayden

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 14, 1999

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed Amended Claims 1 and 25. Claim 8.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Roberts et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner agreed that the "alpha" and "bravo" correction commands of Roberts et al. do not comprise a pronunciation of a word to be corrected, as in proposed amended claim 1. Confused pronunciation matching of claim 8 was discussed. Mr. Hayden stated that he would amend proposed claim 25 to include the limitation that the corrected spelling is produced using confused spelling matching that treats letters that are commonly confused for one another as a combined letter. Examiner said that the proposed amendment would require a new search, and Mr. Hayden said that he would file a CPA.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.


DAVID R. HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.